

REMARKS

The amendment is made in response to the Office Action dated August 8, 2005. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1 and 13-19 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Girard, U.S. Patent No. 6,650,695 (hereinafter *Girard*) over Greeff et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,169,474 (hereinafter *Greeff*). Claims 2-12 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over *Girard*.

Claim 13 is amended as shown above. Specifically, independent claim 13 is amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection. Claims 14 and 15 are canceled herein without prejudice. Thus, claims 1-12 and 16-19 are now pending in the application. For the reasons set forth below, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Traversal of the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 13-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, claims 13 cited the limitation "a flash memory in communication with the module," wherein there was no description of flash memory in the specification. In view of this rejection, this element of claim 13 has been removed via the current amendment to claim 13. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph should be removed. Furthermore, the rejection of each of pending claims 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph should likewise be removed based on their dependency on claim 13.

Traversal of the rejection of claims under Obviousness-type Double Patenting

Each of claim 1-19 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over either *Girard* or a combination of *Girard* and *Greeff*. *Girard* is assigned to the same assignee as the current application (Intel

Corporation). In view of this situation, a terminal disclaimer disclaiming any extra patent term period for the present application that would extend beyond the life of *Girard* (U.S. Patent No. 6,650,695) is attached hereto to overcome the present obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Upon entry of the terminal disclaimer, each of claims 1-19 will be in condition for allowance.

If the undersigned agent has overlooked a teaching in any of the cited references that is relevant to the allowability of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such teaching may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned agent at (480) 715-3787.

*Charge Deposit Account*

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0221 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

Luke E. Girard

Date: 10/28/05



Scott Lane  
Patent Agent, Intel Corporation  
Reg. No. 50,236

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026